

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiesa: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/587,250	07/26/2006	Takashi Nishihara	2006_1135A	8474	
52349 7590 09/11/2009 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P.			EXAM	EXAMINER	
1030 15th Street, N.W. Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503			MULVANEY, ELIZABETH EVANS		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1794		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/11/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/587,250 NISHIHARA ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit Elizabeth E. Mulvanev 1794 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/5/09. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 37.38.40.41.43-56.58.59.61.62 and 64-72 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 37,38,40,41,43-56,58,59,61,62 and 64-72 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abevance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/15/09

Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

6) Other:

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 37-38, 40-41, 43-56, 58-59, 61-62, 64-72 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant argues that a dielectric layer formed of materials excluding S or F, in combination with the specific oxides, are not disclosed. The new art applied address this limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 37, 58 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,334,433.

The reference discloses a recording medium having a dielectric adjacent the recording layer where the dielectric layer is formed of an oxide including the claimed elements (LaSiON). See '433, col. 3. The layers are formed by sputtering in argon gas. See Examples.

Claims 37-38, 40-41, 43-56, 58-59, 61-62, 64-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US US 2005/001695.

The reference discloses a phase change recording medium having a dielectric adjacent the recording layer where the dielectric layer is formed of an oxide including the claimed elements (La2O3, SiO2, Cr2O3, HfO2, ZrO). The layer may further comprise MgO, SiC, SiN, etc.. See Example 3 and Tables. The medium may further comprise interface layer of the claimed materials. See Example 8. The recording material is the same as claimed. See all Examples. The layers are formed by sputtering in Ar. See all Examples. The medium may be double sided. See Example 12.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 37-38, 40-41, 43-56, 58-59, 61-62, 64-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,416,837 in view of us 5,334,433.

The '837 reference discloses a phase change recording medium (can be double-sided) which comprises dielectric layers which may be formed of oxides. The medium further comprises an interface layer and is formed by sputtering in Ar. See Examples. The oxides can be mixed with sulfides. It is recognized that the present claims specify that the dielectric layer does not comprise sulfur. However, the '433 reference shows that a dielectric layer, formed of the claimed materials which does not include sulfur, is known. While the medium is not a phase-change medium, the dielectric layer is formed adjacent the recording layer to provide thermal protective properties, i.e.

Application/Control Number: 10/587,250 Art Unit: 1794

functions the same as the dielectric layer claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the dielectric material of the '433 reference for that in the '837 medium. The substitution of one known dielectric substance for another would yield predictable results.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goadman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Orman, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thoringmon, 418 F.2d 528, 165 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 37-38, 40-41, 43-56, 58-59, 61-62, 64-72 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-73 of copending Application No. 10/895,870. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they cover the same medium where the dielectric material may be of the same materials, i.e. mixture of oxides of Zr and La.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth E. Mulvaney whose telephone number is 571-272-1527. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Ruthkosky can be reached on 571-272-1291. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Elizabeth E. Mulvaney/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794